

It may be time to make changes to what is allowed in content of FCC controlled broadcasts. The changes that I would suggest are both more restrictive and more permissive. Consider the following points:

-----

1. I believe that (local and state) laws that apply to public behavior should also apply to what is broadcast on FCC regulated media. Likewise, the laws that regulate restricted access entertainment, (such as theaters and clubs) should determine what is acceptable for restricted access broadcast television (subscription access or is blocked by the "V-chip".) It is up to the local culture to determine what is legally acceptable (as with alcohol). It is up to the individual broadcaster to regulate the content of their programming. They are responsible for obeying the laws inside their complete broadcast area. The FCC should not be responsible for how each station serves its community, except they may need to intervene where there is interstate dispute. But if the broadcaster is not responsive to their communities, the FCC should not hesitate to revoke their license.

-----

2. It is the intent of the "V-chip" technology to allow the viewers to self-regulate the material he/she is allowed to view. The V-chip has been installed in televisions over 13 inch since the year 2000. If a significant percentage of the televisions that are now in use have this technology, it is time to take advantage of it. When a filtered program starts, there is currently a notification that "This program material may not be suitable for all audiences", this should be expanded to recommend to parents to set up the televisions content filter accordingly.

For those broadcasters who violate the "V-chip" protection coding, the penalty should be severe, including revoking the license to broadcast for multiple offenses.

a. Television manufacturers should be required to enable the "V-chip" as a default setting to the most restrictive and require the television purchaser to make a conscious approval to view restricted material.

b. The FCC should not provide a de facto override of local law and sense of decency.

-----

3. It is the responsibility of the parent to teach his/her children the decency of how to behave. But, let's face it, they learn from all of their environment. Television is only a part of the story; so, let's keep it as healthy as possible. We, as parents, have the obligation and responsibility to determine what they are exposed to, and if we don't, then we have no right to complain. I realize that this varies in different regions, and that is why content should be regulated on a local level.

a. Indecency is not just nudity and "adult situations". It includes our behavior toward others: like listening, talking and our actions. It is hard to teach decency when our children are exposed to a predominance of violence, horror, and negative mythology.

b. There have been many studies that suggest the exposure to television decency and indecency set a standard for acceptable behavior, or suggest that crime is an acceptable roll model. I believe that we should assume the worst and not pollute the brains of our children. We need to take the high road. Crimes, such as "New Town", happen in the mind before they happen in the streets. With rising crime rates, this has to be considered as a possibility, if not a probability.

c. I believe that the amount of violence and gore is a much more serious issue than nudity.

d. There are lots of good stories on television that deal with the challenge of living in a world with sex and violence; and as a parent, I have enjoyed watching them with my children. But there is much that I do not approve of. I am responsible for the development of my children, and I want to determine what is good and what is not. I furthermore respect that other parents should have the same rights, even when their opinions differ from mine.

-----

4. The advertisers need to be held to the same lofty expectations. Lets face a basic truth: With all but a few broadcasters, advertisers pay the bills. The advertisers own the airtime and add some entertainment to entice the viewer to keep watching.

a. The advertisers should be required to have the same requirements as any other portion of a broadcast. The advertiser should not be exempt from any decency and content provisions. The advertisers may own the airtime, but the privilege to broadcast is owned by the society and controlled through the FCC.

b. There is a difference between informing us about a product or service and saturation advertising to brainwashing the public to use their product or service. This is particularly true in the drug industry. I consider this is a serious abuse. No wonder our children are becoming addicts. I believe that there should be a limit of how often a product is advertised, maybe to a maximum of once per hour, or show. I even think that is too much.

-----

5. All too often the media demands their constitutional "right of free speech" but the obligation that "Congress shall ... provide for ... the general Welfare ..." is ignored. The writers of the Constitution did not foresee the advent of the electronic world. I will defend the right of the television industry to use free speech, but I do not agree with them continuing to electronically repeat their message over and over again. If free speech is to be strictly defined, then they need to speak their message every time it is broadcast, not use an electronic copy. Would it be acceptable for someone to repeatedly interrupt you, repeating the same message over and over? No, that would be harassment. There needs to be limits on redundancy. Where is the separation between getting their message out and brainwashing?

-----

It would be ideal if the broadcast industry could self-regulate itself, but the profit motif, and the self-righteous few, prevent this from working. (refer to Federal Communications Law Journal; Volume 51, Issue 3, Article 11 Self-Regulation and the Media

<http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=fclj> )

<<<< I think the decency policies of the FCC need to be revised. >>>>